Information Regarding SB 103 (Teacher Evaluations)   4/14/2015

Dawn Zimmer

President of Zimco & K-12 Evaluation Solutions (a division of Zimco)
Based out of Frankenmuth, Michigan
dzimmer@zimco.net   Cell: 989-529-7510   Office: 888-549-4626

Zimco Background

- In business since 1994, providing technology support to K-12 and government entities.
- 2008 - Zimco selected by Saginaw Valley State University to be the exclusive reseller of STAGES, teacher evaluation software developed at SVSU.
  - STAGES allows districts to automate their evaluation framework of *all* staff
- We worked with Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA) in the development of their School ADvance principal evaluation framework.
- We worked with Silver Strong & Associates (developers of Thoughtful Classroom) to automate their teacher evaluation framework.
- Thoughtful Classroom was one of four evaluation frameworks in the MCEE Pilot. (All districts that piloted STAGES/Thoughtful Classroom renewed their subscriptions for the 13-14 and 14-15 school year.)
- Approximately 200 Michigan Districts, Public School Academies and ISDs currently use STAGES to automate their existing evaluation frameworks.
- Districts in 10 other states uses STAGES.

Establishing Credibility, Dawn Zimmer

- Worked extensively with teacher evaluation since 2008
- Communicate with districts every day regarding their evaluation process
- For the past 5 years – detailed review of how districts completed their evaluations – not in theory, but in reality

Evaluation Terminology

- Frameworks
- Tools
- Evaluation Tools

These 3 terms are used interchangeably throughout the legislation. A framework / tool /evaluation tool describes the evaluation *process*, including the rubric.

- Rubric – the main part of the framework / tool / evaluation tool:

Example of one piece of the RISE Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (out of the state of Indiana):

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Engage students in academic content	For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following: - Teacher provides ways to engage with content that significantly promotes student mastery of the objective - Teacher provides differentiated ways of engaging with content specific to individual student needs - Teacher effectively integrates technology as a tool to engage students in academic content	-3/4 or more of students are actively engaged in content at all times and not off-task - Teacher provides multiple ways, as appropriate, of engaging with content, all aligned to the lesson objective - Ways of engaging with content reflect different learning modalities or intelligences - Teacher adjusts lesson accordingly to accommodate for student prerequisite skills and knowledge so that all students are engaged	- Fewer than 3/4 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task - Teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students, but perhaps not aligned to lesson objective or mastery of content - Teacher may miss opportunities to provide ways of differentiating content for student engagement - Students may appear to actively listen, but when it comes time for participation are disinterested in engaging	- Fewer than 1/2 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task - Teacher may only provide one way of engaging with content OR teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students that are not aligned to the lesson objective or mastery of content - Teacher does not differentiate instruction to target different learning modalities - Most students do not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher makes no effort to adjust instruction for these students

Teacher Evaluation Legislation Timeline

- 2009 – 2011 Michigan's Race to the Top Education Reform Legislation
    - Round I: Public Act 205 of 2009
        - Evaluate every teacher every year
        - Use 4 proficiency levels, not just "Satisfactory" & "Unsatisfactory"
    - Round II: Public Acts 100 – 103 of 2011
        - Tenure Act changes
        - Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness to be created, Leftone state evaluation tool, one student growth assessment tool
    - Round III: This is where we are today. Still waiting for "Round III" to be completed.

- Many districts acted on the above legislation (Round I & II) and developed an effective way to evaluate their teachers.
    - Many districts have put time and resources into developing evaluation frameworks.
    - Many districts have refined and improved the process, and it is working.

- Fall 2011 – Five members of the Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness are named
    - Council's name was later changed to the Michigan Council on Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)

- November 1, 2011 – Deadline for districts to notify the MCEE that they wanted to "opt out" of the yet-to-be-identified state teacher and principal evaluation frameworks.
    - Districts had to mail in their board resolutions declaring an exemption.
    - I was aware of only one district that received a response based on this process.

- 2012-2013 school year: Pilot enacted by the MCEE
    - MCEE chooses 4 different teacher evaluation frameworks to pilot
    - 13 districts pilot 1 of 4 frameworks

- July 2013 – MCEE Recommendation
    - Recommend all four frameworks that were piloted – unless the not-yet-completed pilot *report* identifies issues with any of the frameworks.
    - "If final results from the pilot study produce evidence that suggests that any of these tools is less reliable or practical, this information should be taken into account."

- December 2013 – University of Michigan Institute for Social Research Report on the pilot is complete
    - Report is found at www.mcede.org/reports
    - The final recommendation (page 50) does suggest that some tools are less reliable or practical.

- January 15, 2014 – House Bill 5223 introduced regarding Teacher Evaluation
    - "….shall use 1 or more of the following tools:" – with the 4 piloted frameworks listed

- February 12, 2015 – Senate Bill 103 introduced
    - Does not list any specific frameworks

Feedback Regarding Senate Bill 103

- Positive:
  a. Annual evaluation – with feedback being a focus
  b. Use evaluations to inform decisions on: promotion, retention, professional development
  c. Evaluation process has to be consistent within all schools in a district, Public School Academy, or ISD
  d. If a teacher is rated Highly Effective for 3 years they can be evaluated every other year. (But what should be done on the "off year"? Will districts be penalized if they don't report an effectiveness rating for that teacher to the state?)
  e. Districts post information about their evaluation process and framework on their website
  f. Student Growth percentages for each school year
     - Better (lower percentages) than the original legislation, or other recent bills:
     - 14-15 = "Significant Factor"
     - 15-16 = "Significant Factor"
     - 16-17 = "Significant Factor"
     - 17-18 = 25%
     - 18-19 = 45%

- Negative:
  a. Student Growth
     - Incorporating student growth district-wide will not be fair without a state assessment tool that tests all subject areas *and* provides timely data on student growth.
     - Typical scenario with 25% Student Growth (in Michigan):
       o 25% Student Growth / 75% Final Rubric Scoring
     - Scenarios with no Student Growth:
       o 100% Rubric Scoring
       o 20% Goal Achievement / 80% Final Rubric Scoring
       o 15% Goal Achievement / 15% Assessment of available data / 70% Final Rubric Scoring
  b. Requirement of evaluation tool – "Evidence of reliability, validity and efficacy" will probably be perceived as extremely difficult, and perhaps cost prohibitive for districts. This could be very limiting to districts.